

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified patent application, in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. The presently pending claims are claims 1-6, 9-16, and 18-20. Claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 11 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,320 to Monroe (Monroe) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,704,845 to Ord (Ord).

In response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11 and 16 to better differentiate Applicant's invention from Monroe and Ord. In this Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 7, 8, and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but stated the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 1. The Applicant has also amended claim 11 to include the limitations of claim 8. Additionally, the Applicant has amended claim 16 to include the limitations of claim 17.

Claims 2-6, and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. In addition, claim 18 depends from independent claim 16 and recite additional limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 16. Claim 17 has been canceled. Therefore, the withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of claims 1-6, 9, 11, 16, and 18 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Monroe and Ord and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,359 to Kivela et al. (Kivela). In response, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to better differentiate Applicant's invention from Monroe, Ord, and Kivela. Amended claim 1 includes the limitations of claim 7 which was objected to but considered allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 10 depends from independent claim 1 and recites additional limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Monroe and Ord and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,703,946 to Flick (Flick). In response, the Applicant has amended independent claim 11 to better differentiate Applicant's invention from Monroe, Ord, and Flick. Amended claim 11 includes the limitations of claim 8 which was objected to but considered allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 12-15 depend from independent claim 11 and recite additional limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 11. Therefore, the withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of claims 12-15 is respectfully requested.


The Examiner objected to claims 7, 8, and 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner stated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled. The Applicant also amended claim 11 to include the limitations of claim 8. Claim 8 has also been canceled.

Additionally, the Applicant has amended claim 16 to include the limitations of claim 17. Claim 17 has been canceled.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of claims 1-6, 9-16, and 18-20.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Diaz
Registration No. 40,588

Dated: 8-9-05

Michael L. Diaz, P.C.
555 Republic Drive, Suite 200
Plano, Texas 75074
(972) 578-5669